

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JOSEPH DEONEST JORDAN SHECKLES,

Plaintiff,

v.

4801 FAUNTLEROY LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C19-1448 RSM

ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider Dismissal of Case. Dkt. #9. Plaintiff filed this action on September 11, 2019, and concurrently sought injunctive relief. Dkt. #1. The Court denied Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief because his complaint failed to adequately set forth a claim for relief. Dkt. #7 at 1–2. Instead, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint correcting the identified deficiencies. *Id.* at 3. Plaintiff was given until October 10, 2019, to file an amended complaint. *Id.* After Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint, the Court dismissed the case on December 18, 2019. Dkt. #8.

Nearly 16 months later, Plaintiff filed the pending motion for reconsideration. Dkt. #9. Plaintiff indicates that he failed to respond to the Court's prior orders because he did not receive mailings from the Court. *Id.* at 1. Plaintiff further attributes his failure to file an amended complaint to health issues caused by defendants' actions, the difficulties of COVID-19, and

1 Plaintiff's own loss of housing. *Id.* at 2. Plaintiff indicates that he wishes to continue on with  
2 his case and that "the Defendants are still causing injury to [Plaintiff] and a remedy must be  
3 determined to cease the injuries I am currently facing from the Defendants." *Id.* at 2.

4 "Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions  
5 in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or  
6 legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable  
7 diligence." W.D. WASH. LOCAL RULES LCR 7(h)(1). Further, a motion for reconsideration "shall  
8 be filed within fourteen days after the order to which it relates is filed." W.D. WASH. LOCAL  
9 RULES LCR 7(h)(2). Plaintiff's motion does not satisfy these standards.

10 First, Plaintiff's motion is obviously untimely and is properly denied on that basis.  
11 Second, the Court also denies the motion because Plaintiff has not submitted a draft amended  
12 complaint. The Court's dismissal was premised on Plaintiff's failure to file an amended  
13 complaint demonstrating viable claims. Dkt. #8 at 1–2. To the extent Plaintiff's motion presents  
14 any new facts, it does not demonstrate the viability of Plaintiff's claims or a basis upon which to  
15 grant Plaintiff relief.<sup>1</sup>

16 Accordingly, and having reviewed Plaintiff's motion and the remainder of the record, the  
17 Court finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider Dismissal of Case (Dkt. #9) is  
18 DENIED. This case remains closed.

19 Dated this 20<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2021.

20  
21 

22 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23 <sup>1</sup> The Court does note that Plaintiff's claims were dismissed without prejudice. Dkt. #8 at 2.  
24 This means that the Court's dismissal of Plaintiff's action does not necessarily bar him from  
filing a new action on the same claims, provided that those claims are viable.